

# Minutes

## City of Loma Linda

*Department of Community Development*

### Planning Commission

Chair Rosenbaum called a Adjourned regular meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:03 p.m., **Wednesday, September 29, 2004**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

**Commissioners Present:** Mary Lee Rosenbaum, Chair  
Randy Neff, Vice Chair  
Michael Christianson  
Rene Sakala  
Charles Umeda

**Commissioners Absent:** None

**Staff Present:** Richard Holdaway, City Attorney  
Deborah Woldruff, Director, Community Development  
Lori Lamson, Senior Planner  
Jeff Peterson, Associate Engineer, Public Works Department  
Jocelyne Larabie, Administrative Secretary

**Guest** Lloyd Zola, LSA Associates

#### ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED

Director Woldruff suggested that, because of the importance of the Hillside Designation issue, the Planning Commission continue the discussion to a special meeting to allow them to give that portion of the Draft General Plan their full attention. There were no other items to add or delete.

#### ORAL REPORTS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

#### CONTINUED ITEMS

##### PUBLIC HEARING

PC-04-50 - GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROJECT -The project is a comprehensive update to the City's General Plan, which was originally adopted in 1973. A Draft General Plan document has been prepared based on public input received in various public workshops over the past two years. The draft document has been designed to respond to and reflect the City's changing conditions and community goals in order to guide the City's development during the next twenty years. The project boundaries include all of the City's corporate limits and the Sphere of Influence in the San Bernardino County unincorporated areas generally located south of Redlands Boulevard, east of California Street, south of Barton Road and west of the San Timoteo Creek Channel, and the

southeast portion of the South Hills area into San Timoteo Canyon and south to the Riverside County line. The Draft General Plan document addresses issues and sets broad policies related to Land Use, Community Design, Circulation, Economic Development, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Noise, Safety, Public Services and Facilities, and Historic Preservation.

Director Woldruff presented a brief staff report explaining that on September 15, 2004, the Planning Commission discussed the Mixed-Use Designation Areas D and E and expressed concern about the provisions for residential uses in these two areas and directed staff to contact the City of Redlands for the General Plan and Zoning information for land uses along and in the vicinity of our common boundaries. Ms. Woldruff added that due to time constraints, the Planning Commission did not discuss the Hillside Designation at this meeting.

Director Woldruff stated that as requested by the Planning Commission, staff contacted the City of Redlands to obtain the most current General Plan and Zoning Maps and that a comparison of the maps from 2001 to the current versions shows that nothing has changed in terms of land use designations or zoning for this area in the last three to four years. The following provides a general summary of the land uses that are planned by the City of Redlands in the vicinity of Mixed-Use Areas G and J.

- From Redlands Boulevard south to Park Avenue – High Density Residential Uses with Commercial/ Industrial Uses located further east;
- From Park Avenue south almost to Orange Avenue – Commercial/Industrial Uses;
- From just north of Orange Avenue to a point midway between Orange Avenue and Barton Road – Medium Density Residential; and,
- From a point midway between Orange Avenue and Barton Road to just below Barton Road – Very Low Density Residential Uses

Ms. Woldruff explained that recent economic feasibility studies and fiscal analyses prepared for the Draft General Plan (June 2004) and development projects in the Mission District indicate that there is limited absorption for business-park, light industrial, office, commercial retail, and service uses and that the Mixed-Use Areas proposed for the Mission District in the Draft General Plan were developed based on these factors. She added that the studies did indicate that a mix of residential with limited commercial retail and service uses would meet current market needs. She concluded by saying that one of the advantages of the Mixed-Use concept was that it allowed the flexibility necessary to keep up with market changes.

Chair Rosenbaum opened the discussion regarding concerns expressed by Commissioner Umeda at the meeting of September 15, 2004 in terms of the balance between housing and other types of uses in Mixed-Use Areas G and J. Staff provided the Commissioners with copies of the Market Analysis and Fiscal reports that were required for the Spanos project located at the corner of California Street and Orange Avenue to help them in their discussion. Concerns were reiterated regarding density, transportation and traffic issues; however the discussion centered on the commercial development and setting aside Mixed-Use Areas G and J for future commercial uses.

Chair Rosenbaum pointed out that, in consideration of the Mixed-use Designation for areas G and J, the Planning Commission, had three choices:

- Leave the Industrial Park Designation as is for the next 30 to 50 years to see if commercial uses come to the area;
- Allow the changes to Mixed-use as proposed in the Draft General Plan Update; or
- Reduce and modify the proposed designation.

Chair Rosenbaum asked Mr. Zola to clarify for the Commission the three options she mentioned:

- Leave the Draft General Plan as proposed;
- Increase the emphasis on Office, Industrial and Light industrial uses, or Designate the area for Business Park;

As an example, Mr. Zola proposed language such as "Residential development would not be allowed along California Street and Redlands Boulevard", and he explained that if the market for those uses was not present within the Office, Industrial and Light industrial designation, the City would have to actively recruit potential commercial and industrial users to the area.

Mr. Zola explained that the third option to reduce or modify the designation would require that the California Street frontage be retained as commercial or Business Park uses and that no residential uses be allowed along that street. He added that by choosing that designation, the City would also be taking on the responsibility of recruiting businesses for that area.

Commissioner Umeda asked why the City of Redlands was able to recruit commercial and light industrial that the City of Loma Linda was not. Director Woldruff explained that Redlands could provide incentives, financial or otherwise, for businesses to move to their City that the Loma Linda could offer.

Chair Rosenbaum opened the public comment period at 7:58 p.m.

Mr. Paul Hsu, 20151 Seal Point Lane, Huntington Beach, CA addressed the Commission to explain that he represented property owners in Mixed-Use Areas G and J. Mr. Hsu stated that he understood that in area J, there were 90 acres in the City's Sphere of Influence, and in Area G, 78 acres in. He stated that of the 78 acres in Area J, the intent was for 44 acres to be used for commercial uses on California Street north of Citrus Avenue and only 26 acres for residential. He added that the Spanish Church held a smaller parcel of eight acres. He commented that the land was currently orange groves, which was not a viable use of the land. Mr. Hsu concluded his comments by requesting that the Planning Commission keep the Mixed-use designation for areas G and J according to the Draft General Plan Update.

Tom Nieves, AEI-CASC, 937 S. via Lata, Ste 500, Colton CA, commented that he was working with Mr. Hsu and requested that the Mixed-use designation be maintained as detailed in the Draft General Plan Update to allow for land use creativity. He added, in reference to Commissioner Christianson's comment about a gateway to the City of Loma Linda, that there were many ways to accomplish a distinctive gateway such as entries, treatments, setbacks, and landscape, and reiterated his support for the designation as proposed.

Terry Smith, 18627 Brookhurst Street, Fountain Valley CA, stated that he represented a small piece of property in Planning Area G and requested that the proposed Mixed-Use designation in the Draft General Plan Update. He added that their project was a residential use, with a density under the requirement of 13 units per acre. He added that they were planning a for-sale product with CCRs for entry level or retired homebuyers.

Roger Peter Porter, 3837 E. 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Long Beach CA, stated that he was co-developer of the 2.74 acres on the south west corner of Orange and New Jersey and supported the Mixed-use designation in the Draft General Plan Update. He added that their target identity was working class people, that their project was below the required density and was a quality project. He explained that had he known that the property could become zoned commercial he would not have purchased it. Mr. Porter commented on the issues of traffic stating that developers paid development fees to address that problem. On the issue of identity of the City, he mentioned that there were firms that specialized in providing signage to that effect. Mr. Porter reiterated that he supported the Mixed-Use designation for Mixed-Use Areas G and J.

Director Woldruff pointed out that letters had been received from Mr. Hsu. Mr. Porter followed up with a letter to the City of Loma Linda by the Concord Group, which prepared one of the Economic Feasibility Studies provided to the Planning Commission and a companion letter prepared for Mr. Porter providing preliminary assessment of commercial development opportunity for Mr. Porter's property.

John Shumway, Concord Group, 130 Newport Center Drive, Suite 230, Newport Beach CA stated that he supported of the Mixed-Use zoning being proposed. He explained that they were strategic land use consultants who determined, through market analysis, the best use of a property for many cities throughout California. He complimented staff for proposing a flexible plan in updating the General Plan. Mr. Shumway indicated that their study concluded that a business use would not be appropriate for the area because the cost of the land was too high and therefore commercial types of uses would not be economically viable. Mr. Shumway reiterated his support of Mixed-use because it was the most appropriate and flexible for the future growth of Loma Linda.

Chair Rosenbaum commented, and Mr. Shumway concurred, that it was likely that if a commercial designation was established for the area, commercial developers would need to be subsidized in order to be able to offer the properties a practical amount of rental for the commercial units.

Jonathan Zirkle, 24247 Barton Road, Loma Linda CA commented that he was disturbed by the few options being suggested as being the only viable ones because in his opinion that was a large spectrum of alternatives. He also commented on the issue of "taking" and imminent domain. He indicated that the studies provided by the previous speakers were in favor of the best economical use of their clients' land and was for the short term not the long term as the General Plan was trying to plan for. Mr. Zirkle concluded his comments with references to concerns regarding traffic, increase in population, and the detrimental effects of high density on the City of Loma Linda. He asked the Planning Commission to do what was best for the community.

Hugo Chinchay, 26382 Antonio Circle, Loma Linda CA stated that he was a long time resident of Loma Linda and was speaking for the community. He presented the Planning Commissions with letters on behalf of 350 members of the Loma Linda SDA Spanish Church, 900 members of the Loma Linda Filipino Church located at the site under discussion, the Vice President of the Salvation California Conference and a letter from himself representing the Salvation California Conference Executive Committee. He added that he was in support of the Mixed-Use designation and requested that Area J not become a commercial zoning in consideration for worshipers on Sabbath Day. Mr. Chinchay commented that he knew many young professionals

who could not afford homes in Loma Linda, but would like to be closer to their church and their jobs.

Georgia Hodgkin, 24360 Lawton Avenue, Loma Linda, CA referred to a newspaper article concerning the residents of the City of Redlands who were feeling crowded by 15 homes being constructed on 10 acres. She continued to say the feeling driving through Redlands was very different from Loma Linda and signage was not necessary to see the difference. She requested that the Planning Commission develop a vision of what Loma Linda should look like.

Kathy Glendrange, 26551 Beaumont Avenue, Loma Linda, CA spoke to the increase in population because of the proposed high density designation, air quality, and traffic if the Mixed-Use Designation was approved for the General Plan Update.

Jay Gallant, 26284 Cresthaven Court, Loma Linda CA, commented that:

- Highest and best use was not always economics;
- Vision of Loma Linda needed for the long term;
- Commercial development needed not more residential;
- Supported Option 3 – Modification of the proposed Mixed-use designation.

Roger Peter Porter, 3837 E. 7<sup>th</sup> Street, Long Beach CA on the issues of trees, Mr. Porter stated that their project was planning on planting 110 trees on 2.7 acres and would also save the existing large palm trees on New Jersey Street. Director Woldruff indicated that Mr. Porter's comments were project-specific and could not be addressed at this time.

Vice Chair Neff commented on the following topics:

- Reports provided by staff do not support commercial use in those planning areas and spoke to providing development for housing for people who work in the city or who would like to move to the city;
- Professional people working in Loma Linda could not find homes in the city;
- Traffic issues – Development fees were collected to correct the problem;
- Measure I in force and proposed to be extended to continue to provide repair for local road, paving, widening, installation of signals, correcting busy intersection, and improving on/off freeway ramps;
- Review of the Traffic Impact Analysis and the Circulation Element;
- Church members want to live in the Loma Linda area;
- Commercial uses along main arteries would remain vacant while the residential in the center of the area would have developed;

Vice Chair Neff stated that he supported the Mixed-Use Designation for Areas G & J and was ready to make a motion.

Commissioner Umeda commented that the letters provided by the churches seemed to imply that the current zoning was being changed from residential uses to commercial, although the area already had a commercial designation.

A discussion ensued regarding the views of the community in regards to high density, future of commercial uses, and the ability of commercial development to conform to the Historic Mission Overlay District.

Director Woldruff commented that staff had noted the Planning Commission's comments and concerns and stated that she felt that staff could formulate language to bring back to the Commission at a later date.

Mr. Zola summarized the discussion and stated that he could bring back some specific wording. He indicated that three different objectives:

- Employment Generation which starts pushing towards business park, industrial and office uses;
- Sales tax generation commercial leading towards the retail uses;
- Affordable housing, which was pushing the high density.

He added that the direction that the Planning Commission did not want to take:

- Create a broad area of high density uses, and that the majority of the Commissioners don't want high density; and,
- Create a fairly high intensity traffic generator as a whole.

Mr. Zola indicated that he understood that the Planning Commission wanted to:

- Formulate language to modify the policies to come up with a pattern that would fit the existing approvals;
- Maintain the frontages on California Street for commercial, Business Park, and office uses, and provide for a mix of uses that would have high density but also some low density uses for a better mix of residential density through this area;
- The one thing that's been very clear is that we should not create a situation, even if it's commercial on the frontage and a broad of high density after that.

Mr. Zola stated that he and staff would come back with wording that provided a balance between those objectives and the things that the Planning Commission and the residents did not want in regards to high density.

Director Woldruff stated that the language would provide opportunities, some type of performance standards, and proof of what is doable to bring forward with projects on an individual basis.

Commissioner Umeda wished to direct Mr. Zola to at least attempt to come up with something of a compromise so that the Planning Commission could be supportive of the language to forward to the City Council. Director Woldruff concurred that staff would like to send forward a consensus on those Mixed-Use Areas.

**Motion by Umeda, seconded by Christianson, and carried 4-1, Rosenbaum opposed, to continue this item to October 20, 2004 to allow the consultant time to draft language for Mixed-Use areas G & J for further review by PC, and to discuss the Hillside Area Mixed-Use.**

#### **REPORT BY THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS**

A discussion developed regarding student housing and the lack of opportunity for people to purchase a home and become residents of the City of Loma Linda. Director Woldruff suggested that the issue could be agendized as a study session in the near future.

#### **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT**

Director Woldruff reported that:

- City Council had approved the Mission Creek project on Mission Road;
- City Manager stated that he would like to see the General Plan Update on the agenda for October 12, 2004
- Jeri DeSmet, the Department's part-time Office Assistant would be retiring in December 2004;
- Code Enforcement had been moved to the Community Development Department as of July 1, 2004 and that the cubicles facing the Department counter would be reconfigured shortly. Director Woldruff explained that Code Enforcement Officers were typically under the supervision Community Development Departments in other cities.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion by Christianson, seconded by Neff, and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting to the Regular Meeting of October 6, 2004.**

Minutes approved at the adjourned regular meeting of June 28, 2006.

---

Administrative Secretary

I:\PlanningCom (PC)\PC 2004\Minutes\04Sept29M-draft.doc

# Minutes

# City of Loma Linda

*Department of Community Development*

## Planning Commission

Chair Rosenbaum called a special meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m., **Wednesday, November 10, 2004**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

**Commissioners Present:** Mary Lee Rosenbaum, Chair  
Randy Neff, Vice Chair  
Michael Christianson  
Charles Umeda  
Rene Sakala

**Commissioners Absent:** None

**Staff Present:** Richard Holdaway, City Attorney  
Deborah Woldruff, Director, Community Development  
Lori Lamson, Senior Planner  
Jeff Peterson, Associate Engineer, Public Works Department  
Jocelyne Larabie, Administrative Secretary

**Guest:** Lloyd Zola, LSA Associates

### ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED

There were no items to be added or deleted.

### ORAL REPORTS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Dick Wiley, 10848 Pepper Way, Loma Linda reported a problem with water run-off from the Ryland construction project on Mission Road following recent heavy rains stating that the water overflowed onto Van Leuven Street and then followed Pepper Way, flooding the condominium residences that stand below grade.

Chair Rosenbaum thanked Mr. Wiley for the information.

**PC-04-57 - General Plan Update Project -The project is a comprehensive update to the City's General Plan, which was originally adopted in 1973. A Draft General Plan document has been prepared based on public input received in various public workshops over the past two years. The draft document has been designed to respond to and reflect the City's changing conditions and community goals in order to guide the City's development during the next twenty years. The project boundaries include all of the City's corporate limits and the Sphere of Influence in the San Bernardino County unincorporated areas generally located south of Redlands Boulevard, east of California Street, south of Barton Road and west of the San Timoteo Creek Channel, and the**



**southeast portion of the South Hills area into San Timoteo Canyon and south to the Riverside County line. The Draft General Plan document addresses issues and sets broad policies related to Land Use, Community Design, Circulation, Economic Development, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Noise, Safety, Public Services and Facilities, and Historic Preservation.**

On October 20, 2004, the Planning Commission continued their discussion of the Special Planning Areas and the Hillside designation to a special meeting on November 10, 2004 to ensure that all members were present for the discussion. She informed the Commission that they would be requested to continue the discussion on the Hillside Designation to a joint public hearing/workshop meeting that the City Council asked to be scheduled for January 11, 2005 at 6:00 p.m. She added that she would provide the Commission with more information as it became available.

**Motion by Umeda, seconded by Christianson, and unanimously carried to continue the discussion on the Hillside Designation and Alternatives 1 and 2 to a special joint meeting with the City Council on January 11, 2005 at 6:00 p.m.**

Director Woldruff indicated that the foregoing discussion would include Special Planning Areas (SPA) (formerly Mixed-use Areas) A, B, C, D, G, H and J. Director Woldruff informed the Commission that since her staff report was written Mr. Robert Frost, from the Loma Linda Foundation had withdrawn his request regarding SPA "A" but not his concerns with Special Planning Areas "B" and "C" as described below:

- SPA "B" restricted the Anderson Street frontage to commercial retail uses and should provide opportunities for integration of commercial uses throughout the planning area.
- SPA "C" specified that a future parking structure would be placed west of the existing Ritchie Circle; however, the language should be more general so that the future parking structure could be placed where it was most needed at that time.

She continued to say that, at the October 20, 2004, staff was directed to provide the Commissioners with copies of the existing General Plan Land Use Plan Map and the Official Zoning Map along with the applicable text in the Existing General Plan and Zoning documents. She added that staff was also asked to provide a map showing Special Planning Area "G" and the layout of existing and proposed future uses.

Director Woldruff reported that she contacted the County of San Bernardino regarding the Land Use designation and density as directed by the Planning Commission but the County had not returned her calls. She added that she was confident that from previous business that most of the area was rural residential.

Senior Planner Lamson displayed a PowerPoint presentation showing the following projects: the two Specific Plan areas, American Pacific Homes on the south side of Mission Road, the Ryland tract under construction, the Fairfield proposal, currently on hold, the Roger P. Porter project at the south west corner of Orange Avenue and New Jersey Street, the Spanos Barton Vineyard project, Lake Development, Granite Homes, Trimark, the Steven Walker proposal, the Morgan Tract, and the Gottuso tract.

Commissioner Umeda pointed out that the legend on the handout just provided by a member of the audience for the County lands in Special Planning Area "J" was zoned residential at 14.9 du/ac.

Chair Rosenbaum opened the public comment period at 7:10 p.m.

Jeff Goldfarb, Rutan & Tucker, 611 Anton Boulevard, Suite 1400, Costa Mesa, CA representative for property owners in Special Planning Area "J" thanked staff for their help. He commented that he was not in favor of a purely commercial land use designation for the entire SPA "J", but would support a Residential or a Mixed-Use Designation for that area. He commented that, according to the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) the City Loma Linda was job rich (1.78 jobs per household) and housing poor and in his opinion designating the property solely for commercial development would increase that imbalance.

Mr. Goldfarb continued to say that economic factors were not good for the future viability of commercial development in SPA "J" and added that the Draft General Plan Housing Element described the need for more affordable housing in the City. He also asked about the provenance of the numbers used in calculating the traffic demand that would be created by the development of property in SPA "J" for the correlation with other Elements of the Draft General Plan.

RuthAnn Lehrer, 2730 Washington Avenue, Santa Monica, CA commented that she worked with Roger P. Porter on projects concerning historic preservation as the Neighborhood and Historic Preservation Officer for the City of Long Beach. She continued to say that Mr. Porter had asked her to consult with him on the Mission Groves project located in Special Planning Area "G" as the project comes under the requirements of the Historic Mission Overlay District (HMOD). Ms. Lehrer continued to say that the Mission Grove project attempted to conform to the HMOD design criteria and development standards and that she thought that some flexibility had been built into the Ordinance. She commented that she favored a Mixed-Use Designation for Special Planning Area "G" because residential development was more compatible with historical resources than commercial uses.

On a question by Commissioner Christianson, Ms. Lehrer stated that she interpreted the text of the Ordinance to say that densities could vary on a case-by-case basis not as various densities within the same project.

Roger P. Porter, 3837 E. 75<sup>th</sup> Street, Long Beach. He spoke to about SPA "G" pointing out that:

- Staff and the Consultant from LSA Associates supported residential uses;
- The Market Feasibility study performed by The Concord Group indicated that the site was very weak in terms of supporting commercial uses;
- Comments made by Ms. Lehrer which supported residential uses as more compatible with the Historic Mission Overlay District requirements than commercial development;
- Comments by area churches indicating that commercial development would not be compatible for the current use of the area.

Paul Hsu, 20151 Seal Point, Huntington Beach, CA indicated that his property was in the County area and was zoned for residential use at 14 du/ac. He distributed document prepared by his engineer describing the property and showing the location of sites 1 & 2 in SPA "J" and site 3 in SPA "G".

Allen Dangermond, 912 Pacific Street, Redlands CA explained that he and his wife were the former owners of Mr. Hsu's property and stated that Mrs. Dangermond worked on East Valley Corridor study. He indicated that the corridor area was designated for multi-zoning and the County ruled that the density would be less than 20 du/ac.

Director Woldruff informed Mr. Dangermond that the San Bernardino County no longer followed the East Corridor Specific Plan.

Richard Feenstra, 131 Cajon, Suite 6, Redlands, CA stated that he was a property owner in SPA "J" on the north east corner of Citrus Avenue and New Jersey Street, which was currently zoned for light industrial uses and that he favored Multi-Use designation. He described some of the vandalism problems he experienced because the property was out of the way and stated that he would like to see the area developed into a nice community to help in preventing this type of nuisance. He added that the Mixed-use being proposed looked to be intelligent.

Jonathan Zirkle, 24247 Barton Road, CA commented that the developers were from out-of-town and didn't care about Loma Linda and added that members of the community were not in favor of residential development in that area, but wanted the preservation of the orange groves. Mr. Zirkle stated that there was a lack of vision on the part of the developers. He encouraged the Planning Commission to listen to community and make Special Planning Areas "G" & "J" commercial and light industrial not mixed-use or residential because of traffic and density issues.

Georgia Hodgkin, 24360 Lawton, Loma Linda explained that she was a member of the Historical Commission commented that the intent of the Overlay District was to create a rural atmosphere, which would be impossible with the density that the developers were asking for. Ms. Hodgkin urged the Planning Commission to adopt a General Plan that matched the current City Code, which required 7200 square feet per lot.

Larry Cole, 11688 Terracina Boulevard, Redlands, CA. commented that he owned a small parcel of land in SPA "J" and that he heard that there was an attempt to create a giant open space in SPA J. He continued to say that when a person purchased a property that was already zoned, changing the zoning to open space or any other designation after the purchase was akin to a "taking" without paying for the land.

Terry Smith, 18628 Brookhurst, Fountain Valley, CA commented that his firm had produced the handout that Mr. Hsu distributed to the Commission earlier in the meeting. He continued to say that he went to the City of Redlands and to the County to research the zoning and found that the area was zoned 14.5 du/ac, with a 3,000 square foot net land area per unit. Mr. Smith explained that he wanted to convey to the Commission that the information was accurate and to prove that they did indeed research the zoning before producing the document. He stated that he wished to speak in favor of the mixed-use proposed for SPA "G". He added that if SPA "G" was changed to a commercial designation, it would make a recently approved project, the Spanos-Barton Vineyard project a legal non-conforming use.

Christine Chaves, 26660 Citrus Avenue, Redlands stated that her property was in the Sphere of Influence of the City of Loma Linda and urged the Commission to consider drought, availability of schools, flood, and traffic issues in their discussion.

Joe Murray, 26547 Park Street, Loma Linda stated that he purchased his property several years ago with the understanding that it was designated a mixed-use area, thinking that he would develop it in the future. He added that he would like it to remain a Mixed-Use Designation.

Hortense Garcia, 10886 New Jersey Street, Loma Linda located in the County unincorporated area spoke to the issues of annexation, increase in traffic on New Jersey Street and the problems they experienced trying to get out of their driveway. She also commented that on the issue of drainage. She reiterated that she did not want her property to be annexed to the City of Loma Linda.

Chair Rosenbaum closed the public comment period at 7:59 p.m.

Discussion on Special Planning Area "G"

A discussion ensued regarding what the Planning Commission envisioned as the best use of land for the City of Loma Linda. The Commission also discussed the fate of properties in Special Planning Area "G", which might already have a designation different from the designation in the Draft General Plan. Director Woldruff explained that those properties had requested General Plan Amendments and Zone Changes, which were approved by the City Council. She added that any change of designation in the Draft General Plan would be akin to asking the City Council to change a previously approved project. Chair Rosenbaum commented that there were only two small parcels that needed to be given a designation in SPA "G".

Director Woldruff indicated that the property at Barton Road and California Street was approved as a mixed-use designation. She added that medical uses were being proposed for the parcels located on the south west corner of Citrus Avenue and New Jersey Street, and Barton Road and New Jersey Street. She recommended a mixed-use designation for the Roger P. Porter parcel and added that it was the purview of the Planning Commission to decide on the density of the project at the time of the submittal even if the developer were proposing something different.

Mr. Zola stated that there were five pieces that needed to be assigned a designation:

- 1) Barton Road and California Street;
- 2) Spanos, Barton Vineyards (Existing approval for high-density);
- 3) Church property;
- 4) Orange Avenue and New Jersey Street; and
- 5) North east corner of Barton Road and New Jersey Street (Proposed for medical use)

**Chair Rosenbaum summarized the issues and obtained a consensus from the Commissioners on the designation of the five pieces of property:**

- 1) Barton Road and California Street – Commercial;**
- 2) Spanos – Existing high-density;**
- 3) Church – Current designation was High-density residential – Churches can be placed in non-residential zones;**
- 4) Orange Avenue and New Jersey Street – Medical – Not in the City and in the event it was not annexed, the County allowed high-density in the area;**
- 5) Northeast corner of Barton Road and New Jersey Street – Medical use – Keep Professional Office current land use.**

**For the property at Orange Avenue and New Jersey Street, it was a majority of a show of hands to give that area a Professional Office designation.**

Following further discussion, the following motion was made:

**Motion by Umeda, seconded by Christianson, and carried by a vote of 3 yeas and 2 nays, to Re-designate Special Planning Area "G" from commercial, high-density residential, office and health care per discussion and amend to a Professional Offices designation.**

Mr. Zola assured the Planning Commission that he would inform the City Council of the disagreement for the designation for Special Planning Area "G".

Discussion Special Planning Area "J"

Director Woldruff read a letter submitted by D. & S. Johnson, residents of Park Avenue to be placed in the public record.

"ATTN:Raul

Please forward this letter to Charlie Umeda

Dear Charlie,

My name is Sandy Johnson, my husband, Doug and I live on the corner of Park Avenue and California Street in Redlands, we understand that you are opposed to any further development in our area.

Neither, Doug or myself (sic) are able to attend the meeting being held tonight, but were hoping you would be able to express our extreme opposition to any further building in our area. In our neighborhood, they have already started building apartments on Brookside Avenue and California Street. This construction in itself has added to the traffic congestion on California Street. Plans are in the works for Orchard Park and University village across the street from our house. We can only imagine the negative impact of any further development in this area.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

The letter was signed by Sandy Johnson, 26511 W. Park Avenue, Redlands, CA 92373. Phone: (909) 792-8642."

The discussion continued and Chair Rosenbaum indicated that the current Draft General Plan designation for Special Planning Area "J" was mixed-use.

Vice Chair Neff commented that the Planning Commission had always been considerate of property owners and it would be unjust not to take into account their testimony on the issue.

Commissioner Umeda commented that there was support for commercial uses and professional office and business parks but along with great concerns about traffic. He continued to say that he did not recall hearing that they wanted high-density and because of the many uses included

in the commercial designation, property owners would be able to find a project that could be built there. He concluded stating that based on their discussion on October 20, 2004 regarding Special Planning Area "J" he called for a motion to forward to City Council.

**Motion by Neff, seconded by Rosenbaum, and failed by a vote of 2 yeas and 3 nays to approve Special Planning Area "J" with those language revisions that were proposed at the October 20, 2004 meeting.**

A second motion was made by Umeda to designate Special Planning Area "J" as commercial including the type of category within the current commercial designation.

Mr. Zola pointed out that the designation as described in the Draft General Plan dated October 2004 was a Business Park Designation which provided for professional offices, research and development activities, light industrial along with limited retail and service uses.

Commissioner Umeda amended his motion to read:

**Motion by Umeda, seconded by Sakala, and carried by a vote of 3 yeas and 2 nays to designate Special Planning Area "J" as Business Park as defined within the current Draft General Plan.**

Mr. Zola assured the Planning Commission that, as with Special Planning Area "G", he would inform the City Council of the disagreement for the designation for Special Planning Area "J".

#### Discussion of Special Planning Area "H"

Mr. Zola proposed to remove all references to medium-density in Special Planning Area "H".

A discussion ensued regarding the proper balance of residential development and parks and open space. Mr. Zola suggested that commercial uses be restricted to Barton Road, with residential not to exceed 5 du/ac on any project.

Traffic and noise issues were also discussed and Mr. Zola indicated that the noise standards contained in the Draft General Plan did make reference to a large buffer for Special Planning Area "H". The discussion continued briefly on the issue of noise produced by train whistles.

Director Woldruff commented that the residents of Special Planning Area "H" were removed from Loma Linda proper because of their geographical location and therefore, should have opportunities to meet other residents through the proper planning of parks and open space.

Mr. Zola suggested that they keep the requirements, which exist in the General Plan and continue to allow for Planned Community.

Chair Rosenbaum summarized the discussion regarding Special Planning Area "H" stating that the permitted uses would be designated residential not to exceed 5 du/ac on any project, some commercial use along Barton Road, and neighborhood commercial and services, if appropriate.

Director Woldruff proposed that the Implementing Policies for Special Planning Area "D" be used as revisions to Special Planning Area "H". Mr. Zola added that the language for Special Planning Area "H" would require Specific Plans for design guidelines on the east end of Barton

Road. Commissioner Umeda suggested incorporating more trail links to Beaumont Avenue & City trails.

**Motion by Christianson, seconded by Umeda, and unanimously carried to forward Special Land Use Area "H" to City Council as amended.**

Discussion on Special Planning Area "D"

There was a brief discussion regarding Special Planning Area "D" that included Mr. Zola's suggestion that the language used for Special Planning Area "H" relating to the requirement for a Specific Plan be applied to Special Planning Area "D" with an added reference to a village setting concept and a reduced density of 4.5 du/acre if more commercial was requested by developers. The Planning Commission stipulated that a percentage of dwelling units with an estate designation of 1-2 du/ac be set at 20% and that streets be realigned to protect existing orange groves and oaks trees.

Director Woldruff reiterated that detached single-family medium-density was being removed.

Mr. Zola confirmed the addition of language similar to the language in Special Planning Area "H" would be used to indicate a density of 4.5 du/ac and the possibility of the approval of smaller lots if commercial uses and high-end amenities were proposed. Mr. Zola suggested that the percentage of dwelling units could be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

**Motion by Umeda, seconded by Christianson, and unanimously carried to approve the revision to Special Planning Area "D" as presented on October 20, 2004 with modification of limiting the village square concept to 20% of dwelling units and identifying a village area with a density specified for commercial at 0.5 ratio and forward to City Council with modifications.**

Having completed the review of all Special Planning Areas, the following motion was made:

**Motion by Umeda, seconded by Christianson, and unanimously carried, to forward the revisions to Special Planning Areas (formerly Mixed-Use) A, B, C, D, G, H, and J to City Council.**

**PC-04-58 - APPROVAL OF MINUTES – MINUTES OF OCTOBER 20, 2005 & JUNE 23, 2005**

**Motion by Christianson, seconded by Neff, and carried by a vote of 3-0, to approve the Minutes of the Adjourned Regular Meeting of June 23, 2004. (Commissioners Umeda and Sakala were not yet appointed to the Planning Commission.)**

**Motion by Neff, seconded by Umeda, and carried by a vote of 4-0, Commissioner Christianson absent, to approve the minutes of the Special meeting of October 20, 2004.**

**REPORTS BY PLANNING COMMISSIONERS**

Commissioner Umeda reported that he and his wife were the proud parents of a baby boy born Sunday, November 7, 2004 at 9:48 a.m. He weighed 8 lbs 1 on and his name was Charles Justin Umeda.

Everyone joined in to congratulate Commissioner Umeda and his wife on the new baby.

**REPORT BY THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

Director Woldruff reported that the schedule for public hearings on the Draft General Plan was posted on the city's website. She added that the public hearing schedule for the University Village/Orchard Park would be discussed at the December 1, 2004 meeting and dates selected based on the availability of the Commissioners.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:59 p.m.

*I:\PlanningCom (PC)\PC 2004\Minutes\04Nov10M-draft.doc*

DRAFT



# Minutes

# City of Loma Linda

*Department of Community Development*

## Planning Commission

Chair Mary Lee Rosenbaum called a special meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:00 p.m., **Wednesday, November 17, 2004**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

**Commissioners Present:** Mary Lee Rosenbaum, Chair  
Randy Neff, Vice Chair  
Michael Christianson  
Charles Umeda  
Rene Sakala

**Commissioners Absent:** None

**Staff Present:** Richard Holdaway, City Attorney  
Deborah Woldruff, Director, Community Development  
Rolland Crawford, Director/Fire Chief, Public Safety  
Lori Lamson, Senior Planner  
Jeff Peterson, Associate Engineer, Public Works Department  
Jocelyne Larabie, Administrative Secretary

**Guest:** Lloyd Zola, LSA Associates

### **ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED**

There were no items to be added or deleted. However, Director Woldruff requested that Item No. 2, Appeal of the single-family residence located on Lawton Avenue, be heard first. Chair Rosenbaum agreed to the change in the order of the discussion items.

**PC-04-59 - APPEAL OF SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE (SFR) NO. 04-05 - An appeal of the Director's approval of a request to construct a 2,914 square-foot single-family residence on an existing vacant lot. The project is located on a lot west of 24527 Lawton Avenue.**

Planning Technician Allan Peñaflorida reported that the item was an appeal of the Community Development Director's approval of Single-Family Residence (SFR) 04-05 and added that the appeal cited possible drainage issues affecting properties adjacent to the proposed site.

Mr. Peñaflorida explained that on September 27, 2004, a new 2,914 square-foot single-family residence was approved by the Community Development Director on a vacant lot located west of 24527 Lawton Avenue. Ms. Denise Gotta of 24527 Lawton Avenue, located east of and adjacent to the project site, filed an appeal of this decision on October 4, 2004 stating concerns about the increase of water runoff caused from the construction of the new home and the effects of the drainage system to be installed on the subject property.

Mr. Peñaflorida stated that the issues relative to the appeal were addressed through the project design and the conceptual design of the Bela Vista Subdivision (Tract No. 5287), that all elements of the project were consistent with the existing General Plan and appeared to be consistent with the Draft General Plan Update (October 2004). He added that the project was in compliance with the Single-Family Residence (R-1) zoning regulations and that implementation of the Conditions of Approval would ensure that the project complied with all applicable City standards and requirements, and was compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

In response to questions from the Planning Commission regarding run-off and drainage, City Associate Engineer Jeff Peterson explained that there was a drainage easement which crossed both the Pillar and Gotta properties but the plans showed the run-off continuing into the natural flow channel. He added that the plans indicated an additional easement to the east of the existing one, which would accept the historic drainage, redirect it around the pad of the house and reconnect with the historic path before leaving the applicant's property. Mr. Peterson stated that the applicant had recently submitted a storm plan showing a slightly different alignment, which ended several feet before the property line and spread the water to the historic spread pattern before crossing the property line.

Chair Rosenbaum opened the public comment period at 7:15 p.m.

Mr. Kevin Nick, 24615 Lawton Avenue, Loma Linda, property owner to the east of the subject, wanted to know if the toe of the slope was protected from run-off. Mr. Peterson replied that the work being done on the applicant's property was not close to the toe of the slope.

Denise Gotta, 24527 Lawton Avenue, Loma Linda, Appellant, spoke to the Commission reaffirming her concern regarding the drainage onto her property. She stated that she would like to see the new plans for the drainage pipe because she suspected that the applicant was requesting to remove the drainage easement and adding a two-foot pipe draining at the edge of her property. She added that the applicant was building his property six inches higher, was using the total allowable setback, and was cutting into the bank.

Chair Rosenbaum asked Mr. Peterson about the recently submitted plans and he explained that the latest submittal was a storm drain plan.

Senior Planner Lamson replied that the storm drain plan that Mr. Peterson would be reviewing was subject to the Conditions of Approval and requirements of the Department of Public Works to satisfy those conditions. She added that Ms. Gotta's appeal was for the approval of the house, which must still satisfy the Conditions of Approval and the approval of the Public Works Department.

In order to clarify what the Planning Commission must decide on, Chair Rosenbaum summarized the discussion. She stated that the single-family residence was approved for the location, and the appeal was filed in regards to the single-family residence along with the Conditions of Approval for the project.

Georgia Hodgkin, 24360 Lawton Avenue, Loma Linda, stated that she lived around the corner from the proposed project and pointed out her property was subject to CCRs, which required the lots in the tract to be one acre or more. She added that she wanted to know if the Department ensured that the CCRs were met. Director Woldruff replied that the subject lot was split several years ago, in 1992, recorded, and must have followed the regulations in the CCRs.

Chair Rosenbaum closed the public comment period at 7:26 p.m.

A discussion ensued regarding the easement and the overall drainage issues. Director Woldruff suggested that the plans were available for the Commission's viewing and added that some time could be taken to have Mr. Peterson go over the proposal with the Commissioners. Chair Rosenbaum agreed and the Commissioners stepped away from the dais to review the plans with Mr. Peterson.

Ms. Gotta wanted to make one more remark and commented that the applicant, Mr. John Pillar, had stated that he felt that it was an oversight on the part of the City for not installing the pipe when the lot was subdivided. She added that the City felt at the time that the pipe did not need to be installed until the properties were developed.

The Planning Commission explained that they had a better understanding of the issue of the run-off being diverted around the new structure and then redirected to the historic water flow and would not damage the adjoining properties. Staff emphasized that the applicant would have to satisfy all of the Conditions of Approval before any permits would be issued and that would include any condition the Public Works Department would add to appropriately address the issue of the drainage.

**Motion by Christianson, seconded by Neff, and unanimously carried to deny the appeal and uphold Staff's approval of the Single-Family Residence (SFR) No. 04-05 subject to the Conditions of Approval.**

Director Woldruff stated to the Planning Commission that staff would continue to work closely with the applicant and Ms. Gotta to ensure that the project moved smoothly through the process.

**PC-04-60 - GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT (GPA) NO. 04-03, ZONE CHANGE (ZC) NO. 04-03, TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TTM) NO. 16811, PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN (PPD) NO. 04-04, AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT - A proposal to change the general plan land use plan and zoning maps from professional office and administrative professional to mixed-use and planned community to accommodate a 30-lot subdivision on approximately 3.0 acres of land located at the southwest corner of orange avenue and new jersey street. the project includes requests for approval of the proposed housing designs and a development agreement to address the city's affordable housing requirements.**

Assistant Planner Colunga reported that the item was a continued item from the October 6, 2004 Planning Commission meeting. He continued to say that the proposal was for 30 single-family residences on three acres at the southwest corner of Orange Avenue and New Jersey Street and that the applicant was requesting a General Plan Amendment, Zone Change, Tentative Tract Map, Precise Plan of Design and a Development Agreement.

Mr. Colunga explained that, at the November 10, 2004 meeting, the Planning Commission voted to designate the subject 3-acre parcel, located in Special Planning Area "G", within the draft General Plan Land Use Element, as "Professional Office". He added that the proposed designations for the remaining acreage would include a commercial designation at the north east corner of Barton Road and California Street, high density for the Barton Vineyard project on the south east corner of Orange Avenue and California Street, the Filipino Seventh Day Adventist Church on the north east corner of Orange Avenue and California Street, and professional office for at the northeast corner of Barton Road and New Jersey Street.

Mr. Colunga indicated that the applicant had provided a letter from Ruthann Lehrer dated November 11, 2004 and one letter from Terry Smith of KTK Construction dated November 17, 2004.

Mr. Colunga explained that if the Planning Commission decided to deny the project based on the direction given at the November 10, 2004 meeting for Special Planning Area "G", it was staff's recommendation that the denial be without prejudice.

Attorney Holdaway explained that the applicant could resubmit his application without additional application fees. Director Woldruff added that if the General Plan Amendment or Zone Change were denied at the Planning Commission level, the application would need to be appealed to the City Council whereas if the requests were approved the project would automatically go forward to City Council.

Chair Rosenbaum opened the public comment period at 7:45 p.m.

Terry Smith, 18627 Brookhurst Street, Fountain Valley CA, applicant, explained that he wanted to go on the record regarding the reasons for his request for a Zone Change. He commented that 100% of the property around his parcel was zoned medium to high density, 9 to 13 du/acre. He added that the rezoning of a 22-acre parcel on the corner of Orange Avenue and California Street to high-density residential had already occurred and he continued to compare the density and the traffic related to that and other properties in the vicinity to his own parcel on the Corner of Orange Avenue and New Jersey Street.

Paul Hsu, 20151 Seal Point Lane, Huntington Beach CA, stated that he was speaking in favor of the project, his neighbor to the south. He added that he attended the City Council meeting on the November 16, 2004 where the Council discussed the Economic Development Element of the Draft General Plan and the Council stated that the City of Loma Linda offered more high-end jobs than any other city in the Inland Empire and that they expected that trend to continue for several years. Mr. Hsu continued by stating that if the land designation was maintained as a Professional Office designation, the resulting project would bring in much more traffic, pollution, noise than a smaller residential project would. He concluded his statement by urging the Planning Commission to approve this project, Tentative Tract Map (TTM) 16811.

Chair Rosenbaum closed the public comment at 7:50 p.m.

Vice Chair Neff stated that his concerns were similar to Mr. Hsu's in regards to traffic and affordable housing. He added that one way to reduce traffic was to provide jobs and housing in the City of Loma Linda, stressing that a commercial site would not solve the City's need for housing. He concluded stating that he was in favor of allowing a housing project to be built.

Commissioner Umeda motioned to deny, with the following findings: 1) the project went before the Historical Commission on August 2, 2004 and it was given a negative recommendation by the Commission; 2) the Planning Commission reviewed the area in the discussion of the Draft General Plan, and by a 3-2 vote changed the zoning designation to Professional Offices.

Director Woldruff commented that staff had provided specific findings for the General Plan Amendment, the Zone Change and the different application components and added that although Commissioner Umeda's findings were reasons for not approving the project, the motion should relate to the findings for this specific project.

Chair Rosenbaum called for a brief recess to allow Director Woldruff the time to make copies of the findings provided in the Staff Report of October 6, 2004 meeting for the members of the Planning Commission.

Attorney Holdaway explained that the Planning Commission's role in some actions was advisory to the City Council and in this case, Item 3, The Development Agreement and Item 4, Tentative Tract Map No. 16811 and Precise Plan of Design PPD No. 04-04 were of an advisory nature. However, this project depended upon a General Plan Amendment and Zone Change and if these were denied by the Planning Commission, the other items would fail because they would be inconsistent with the General Plan and Zoning.

**Commissioner Umeda amended his motion to deny the Adoption of the Mitigated Negative Declaration and the General Amendment based on the finding that the proposed amendment was not internally consistent with the General Plan based on the Planning Commission discussion of the Plan, and therefore Recommendations 3 and 4 could not be approved, and Commissioner Sakala seconded the motion, which was approved by a vote of 3-2.**

**Motion by Umeda, seconded by Christianson, and approved by a vote of 4-1 to forward the project to the City Council without prejudice.**

**PC-04-61 - PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN (PPD) NO. 04-10 AND VARIANCE (VAR) NO. 04-04**

Senior Planner Lamson presented the staff report stating that the project was located on the south side of Mission Road, including and west of the Edison Easement, west of California Street and north of the San Timoteo Creek and the railroad, and was proposing to construct 70 single-family units in a neo-traditional design, which would include more than five acres of park and open space. She added that the Precise Plan of Design (PPD) included the site layout and design of the residences, the landscaping, and related amenities.

Ms. Lamson explained that on May 5, 2004, the Planning Commission recommended Tentative Tract Map No. 16323 for approval for 93 houses and forwarded the project to the City Council and that on June 8, July 13, and July 26, 2004, the City Council reviewed and approved the modified Tentative Tract Map No. 16323 for 70 houses.

Ms. Lamson continued to say that a pocket park would provide a landscaped playground with play equipment for the use of the community, that the Edison Easement would be landscaped with areas of orange groves, turf and a community garden with additional landscaped open space areas maintained by a Homeowners Association (HOA). Ms. Lamson reported that Chinese flame trees, California pepper, camphor, and flowering cherry trees would be placed in the parks and open space areas with a grove of dwarf citrus trees planted in the Edison Easement Park.

Ms. Lamson described the project as having the following characteristics:

- Three one-story and two two-story housing plans, with unique architectural styles, which were modern adaptations of amenities found in traditional styles of architecture historic to the area. Each plan would have a "Craftsman" and a "Victorian" style not intended to be exact replicas of the traditional style but contemporary homes with a traditional character;
- Revised color schemes represented in the color illustrations and the color board;

- Houses ranging from 1,656 to 2,480 square feet with several options to increase the number of rooms and/or bedrooms. The plans offer a variety of home sizes that include two, three, and four bedrooms;
- Landscaping to be provided by the developer for the front yard, parkway, exterior side yard and rear yard area outside the private yard;
- Wrought iron fence material along the parks and open space areas with six-foot high tan vinyl fencing for the interior.

Ms. Lamson explained that due to the sloping topography of the project site, the applicant was requesting a variance to exceed the maximum wall height of six feet along the westerly tract boundary of the lots south of Van Leuven Street and adjacent to the existing single-family homes fronting onto Mission Road. She continued to say that staff had been working with the applicant to modify the grading to reduce the height of a majority of the wall along the westerly boundary of the tract, adjacent to the retaining walls of the existing apartments with the exception of an area around the last three lots to the south of the tract that would exceed the six-foot height.

Ms. Lamson stated that through further analysis, it was also determined that the walls surrounding the two existing single-family homes fronting on Mission Road would also have to exceed six feet in height to ensure that the existing residences would have privacy from the homes on a higher elevation; the wall would not exceed nine feet, and would not be visible from public view. She added that also due to the sloped topography, the applicant would take into consideration the existing street elevations and would ensure that the flow would not create cross-lot drainage. Ms. Lamson stated that the applicant indicated that he could provide written acknowledgements accepting the wall height from these two property owners.

Ms. Lamson informed the Commission that one letter of opposition to the variance was received from Courtney Torino who represented the management company of Monterey Pines, the existing apartment complex to the west of the project. Mr. Torino's main concerns involved the construction of a new wall along the westerly property line and asked that a tract boundary wall be constructed without removing the existing wall on the Monterey Pines property.

John Snell, American Pacific Homes, 4959 Palo Verde, Montclair, CA, stated that they had been working on addressing the concerns that staff and the neighbors had regarding the wall. He added that he had slides that would illustrate the variation in wall that would exceed the six-foot height that would be in the back and side yards and the wall adjacent to the apartment complex.

Larry L. Leas, 25886 Mission Road, Loma Linda, stated that he also owned three condominiums in the Mountain View Gardens and that had concerns about the wall being too close to their property but was somewhat satisfied that the proposed changes would not be as significant as first expected. He commented on the recent rainstorm and his concern was that the developers had the water draining into adjacent properties. He added that he wanted to make sure that the drainage was properly addressed once the construction was completed.

Courtney Torino, 95 Argonaut, Suite 250, Aliso Viejo, CA introduced himself as the president of the Management Company and managing member for ownership of the Monterey Pines, property west of the proposed development. He explained that their issue had to do with the block wall adjacent to their property, but added that staff seemed to have addressed several of those issues. He continued to say that he would like to voice some other minor concerns to make sure that they were not forgotten. He spoke on the following topics: Color of the wall – He would like to see it be compatible with their wall; Additional screening with trees in the rear

yards near the proposed houses; Drainage and grading; Mitigation of the dust during construction because of the stockpiling of dirt that well above the apartment complex wall.

Steve Stand, 27 Flowerbud, Irvine CA, stated that he was an architect for the KTG Y group designing the houses for American Pacific Homes. He clarified that the styles were not meant to be exact replicas but to show traditional styles and character elements of the Victorian and Craftsman styles homes. He pointed out the various elements shown on the renderings supplied to the Planning Commission.

Dick Wiley, 10848 Pepper Way, Loma Linda, CA spoke to the issue of drainage because of the recent abundant rain storm and requested some type of mitigation for run off to drain properly between Pepper Way and the easement. He pointed out on that the east side of Pepper Way was higher than the west side, therefore drainage from Van Leuven changes direction to follow the slope down Pepper Way. Mr. Wiley also asked that the look of the driveways on Silva Court facing Pepper Way be softenrd with either planters or some stones on a section of the columns. He concluded stating that he like the project.

Georgia Hodgkin, 24360 Lawton Avenue, Loma Linda thanked the Commission for reducing the number of units before the project went before City Council who further reduced the number of units to 70. She added that the houses on Mission Road were causing quite a bit of concern with the community and she hoped that the new project would not have the same look as the Ryland Homes project south of Mission Road.

David Kent, 17992 Mitchell South, Irvine CA stated that he was a principle at KTG Y Architects and congratulated John Snell of American Pacific Homes and his associate Steve Stand for a great project. Mr. Kent explained that they had designed the new homes with articulations on the rear of the houses to allow neighbors and passersby to view a better looking elevations. He also commented that he was very happy with the colors selected for the materials.

John Snell, American Pacific Homes, 4959 Palo Verde, Montclair, CA approached the podium to address some of the concerns that were expressed during the public comment period.

- Dust – They will do dust control using water trucks;
- Block Wall – The wall will be a tan split face wall;
- Drainage – Two issues: 1) Ryland Homes' catch basins not opened so water flows in the street; 2) Pepper Way not developed to full width, and the entire street slopes toward the condominiums. In this project, the developer would slope their side of Pepper Way towards the project and away from the condominiums;
- Window treatment – They will add window treatments so that the homes have a better look from the street;
- Edison Park – The park was redesigned because of Edison's concerns and the design was updated;
- Monterey Pines request for screening or softening – Backyards landscaping are left to be the responsibility of the new owners.

Chair Rosenbaum closed the public comment period at 8:50 p.m. and opened the discussion to the Planning Commission. The Commission deliberated on the following topics:

- Porches – No railing on the Craftsman and Victorian models – Developer is trying the emulate the historic look of those styles and will work with staff and the applicant to address the issue;

- Front doors on the Victorian Model – Solid construction if possible, with the a glass insert as an upgrade feature;
- Victorian siding/sprayed on stucco – Will give the Victorian a smooth finish to emulate more closely the style of the Victorian;

Mr. Snell explained that Mr. Silva had requested that the street named after him be called "Silva Ranch Road" and Mr. Snell didn't know what the procedure was to change the name of the street. Director Woldruff replied that the street names had already been approved by the City Council.

Mr. Snell also had a question regarding the approval of the PPD and pointed out that staff's recommendation was to forward to City Council. Director Woldruff replied that the recommendation would be changed because the PPDs were approved at the Planning Commission level.

The Planning Commission commended the applicant and the developer for taking a serious look at what the community wanted in regards to architecture and planning.

Chair Rosenbaum requested clarification in regards to the development standards in the PC document pertaining to the number of bedrooms for the two-story models. Mr. Snell replied that he would add the "minimum of" to clarify the statement. He added that he would work with staff to revise the document so it reflects the approved project conditions as directed by the Planning Commission.

Chair Rosenbaum also had questions on the following items:

- Placement of the one-story homes for the two homes on Silva Court closest to Mission Road off of Pepper Lane and along Sinclair Circle next to the Edison Easement – Mr. Snell replied that there wasn't enough room to place the three single-story houses on those lots and added that the best placement for those models would be on the corner of the streets and that the landscaping from the Edison Easement would help to soften the look of the two-story homes;
- Fencing – Provide better and more decorative fencing along Pepper with landscape to shield the fence;
- Benches – Mr. Snell replied that the Edison Company would not allow the placement of benches in the easement.

**Motion by Sakala, seconded by Christianson, and unanimously carried to approve Precise Plan of Design No. 04-10 and Variance No. 04-04 based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval.**

#### **REPORTS BY PLANNING COMMISSIONERS**

No reports were presented.

#### **REPORT BY THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**

Director Woldruff reported that the City Council was reviewing the Draft General Plan and had established a schedule to systematically address the various Elements. She added that there would be a joint City Council/Planning Commission on January 11, 2005.



**ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion by Rosenbaum, seconded by Christianson, and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting.**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

Minutes approved at the meeting of June 28, 2006.

---

Administrative Secretary

*I:\PlanningCom (PC)\PC 2004\Minutes\04Nov17SM-draft.doc*

DRAFT

# Minutes

# City of Loma Linda

*Department of Community Development*

## Planning Commission

A regular meeting of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Michael Christianson at 7:05 p.m., **Wednesday, June 7, 2006**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

**Commissioners Present:**

Michael Christianson, Chair  
David Werner, Vice Chair  
Mary Lee Rosenbaum  
David Varnam  
Frank Povero

**Commissioners Absent:**

None

**Staff Present:**

Richard Holdaway, City Attorney  
Deborah Woldruff, Community Development Director  
Rolland Crawford, Fire Marshall  
H.P. Kang, Senior Planner  
Jeffrey Peterson, Associate Engineer  
Allan Peñaflorida, Planning Technician  
Jocelyne Larabie, Administrative Secretary

### ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED

Director Woldruff reported that there were no items to be added or deleted. Chair Christianson stated that he would reorder the items to start the discussion with Item No. 2 followed by Items 1 and 3.

### ORAL REPORTS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Fred Ramos 26445 First Street, Bryn Mawr addressed the Commission to request that City Staff inspect the houses being built for the Park Lane project on Whittier Avenue at First Street. He stated that he did not think that the builder was constructing the houses to code. Director Woldruff stated that the Building Division used stamped and approved plans when inspecting new construction. After further comments, Mr. Kang stated that he would make an appointment with Mr. Ramos for Monday, June 12, 2006 in the afternoon to inspect the structures that Mr. Ramos suspected of not following the plans.

**PC-06-32 - ZONE CHANGE NO. 06-02, TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 06-02 (17795),  
PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN NO. 06-03, and DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT NO. 06-01**

Senior Planner Kang provided a brief staff report stating that the reason for the request for a continuance was that a further study of the project revealed that a Zone Change was not necessary; however a variance request for side yard setbacks was required.

Chair Christianson commented that he believed that he would need to recuse himself from any discussion on the matter or if public testimony was given because he owned property within the 500 foot radius from the project site.

Chair Christianson opened the public comment period at 7:13 p.m. As there was no one wishing to address the Commission, the public comment period was closed.

**Motion by Rosenbaum, seconded by Varnam, and carried by a vote of 4-0  
Christianson abstaining to continue the item to the Adjourned Regular  
meeting of June 28, 2006.**

**PC-06-33 - PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN NO. 06-02 AND VARIANCE 06-04**

Before the discussion began, Vice Chair Werner commented that because of his work relationship with the Loma Linda University Medical Center he would recuse himself from the discussion. City Attorney Holdaway concurred that because Loma Linda University Medical Center was a source of income for Mr. Werner that it would be prudent for him to do so.

Planning Technician Allan Peñaflorida stated that the project was a request to demolish two existing residential structures and an accessory building in order to construct a new 42,000 square-foot, three-story 58-student apartment building with an underground parking garage. He went on to say that the site was located on the north side of Mound Street, west of Shepardson Drive, and was part of an existing Loma Linda University property. He indicated that the variance request was to reduce the front set back requirement from 25 feet to 18 feet to accommodate a larger entry lobby.

Mr. Peñaflorida continued to say that the Historical Commission recommended an approval of the Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of the two on-site structures and one accessory structure at their meeting of May 1, 2006; however, the Commission also recommended that a working group be formed to work with the applicant and staff to modify the proposed building facades to include architectural elements that were reminiscent of the original College of Medical Evangelists (CME) structures (i.e. pitched roofs, arched window treatments, and associated color schemes). He went on to say that the group met on May 10, 2006 and received a detailed presentation from the Loma Linda University representatives and the architects for the project. Following the presentation, the group expressed their concerns about the building elevations and recommended that the building have architectural tie-ins with historical structures around the project site.

Mr. Peñaflorida stated that his presentation was brief because the applicant and his architect would provide a more detailed PowerPoint presentation of the project.

Chair Christianson opened the public comment period at 7:21 p.m.

Mr. Verlon Strauss, Vice Chancellor for Financial Affairs for the Loma Linda University thanked staff for their work and commented on a good working association throughout the whole project.

He stated that approximately two years ago, Loma Linda University Adventist Health Sciences Center (LLUAHSC) had come before the Planning Commission to share their Campus Master

Plan. Mr. Strauss stated that at that time, the Foundation had provided 10 major goals and objectives as follows:

- Walking Campus
- Secure Environment
- Establish a "Sense of Place"
- Research Focus
- Institutional Strategic Plan
- "To Make Man Whole"
- Preserve & Improve Open Space
- Enhance Quality of Campus Life
- Functional & Aesthetically Pleasing
- Relationship with the Community

Chair Christianson questioned Mr. Strauss regarding the objective of "Preserve & Improve Open Space" and asked what the University's plans were in this regard. Mr. Strauss explained that the University had pledged to improve the current open space and grassy areas around the four buildings of the campus not to develop new ones.

Mr. Strauss explained that the University's student population was growing and that their goal was to provide the students with affordable housing in a secure environment with the ability to walk to their classes. He added that currently the University was providing housing for only 10% of the students and that the goal was to provide increased housing, at a reasonable cost, to 25% of the students.

Mr. Strauss stated that the Daniells Expansion consisted of housing for up to 58 more students, 31 garaged cars, and a 2,400 square foot Dean's apartment in an attractive atmosphere for the residents. He described the facility as follows:

- Four levels – one level planned for underground parking;
- 38, 589 square feet of living space;
- 12,973 square feet of garage space;
- 31 parking spaces;
- A Dean's apartment;
- On site laundry facility; and,
- A patio area for relaxing.

Mr. Strauss then introduced Mr. Bob Carpenter of Onyx Architects to continue with the presentation.

Bob Carpenter, Principal with Onyx Architects, 16 N. Marengo Rd, # 700 in Pasadena proceeded with the description of the project site providing an aerial picture of the location along with pictures of the existing Daniells Hall student housing and a picture of the structures to be demolished.

Mr. Carpenter distributed colored renderings of the project and provided a PowerPoint presentation describing the site and the project. He stated that the new construction was located east of the existing Daniells Hall, where the structures to be demolished were located. He explained that the Historical Commission, at their May 1, 2006 meeting, had requested a redesign of the front entrance to make it more open. Mr. Carpenter described the differences between the two plans were centered around a broader entry plaza for the main entrance, a

porch with a curved roof, and the addition of a curved roof on the left side of the building. He added that the changes that the Historical Commission had requested had been implemented but the Commission had not seen the final design, although they had seen the entrance but not the curved roof over the entrance. He continued to say that they had seen the staircase differential but not the curved element on the east side of the building. He also stated that they were more accurately demonstrating the landscaping scheme.

Mr. Carpenter indicated that they took the comments of the Historical Commission as suggestions for curved windows, etc., and applied their interpretation of the architectural style that should be a University building in this context.

Mr. Carpenter commented that there were security measures built into the complex with a monitored electronic lock system for the front entrance and the garage entrance. He pointed out that the mechanical and electrical rooms were on the lower level in order to keep the roof clear of any mechanical elements, that there was an elevator in the main lobby and a walkway at the top of the front staircase.

Mr. Carpenter showed the Dean's apartment along the east side of the building, which included a outdoor gathering area where the student could visit with the Dean. He listed the amenities for students such as a patio, a common laundry room, and an outdoor access to the terrace over the garage. He pointed out the flat roof was empty of mechanical elements, i.e. air shafts, etc. He indicated that he had received guidance from the University that the area was being proposed as an historic museum and that the University wanted to maintain a view from the museum over the building to the mountains beyond.

Mr. Carpenter stated that they had added a driveway and an entrance to the garage along the west side of the building with an exit to the stairway.

Mr. Carpenter then introduced the landscape architect to discuss the landscape plans.

Rick Meyer, Troller Meyer Associates, of Glendale, addressed the Commission and explained that they met with the Historical Commission who suggested the California pepper tree, the Italian Cypress, the Paper Bark tree and bougainvilleas. He continued to say that they had discussed the use of palm trees with the Historical Commission explaining that the University had decided against them because of maintenance and liability issues. He added that Commission understood their reasoning and consented to the use of other species.

Mr. Carpenter continued with his presentation showing slides of existing conditions of the site, site plans, grading plan, the entry and parking levels, the second, third and fourth level floor plans, and the roof plan. Mr. Carpenter answered questions by the Planning Commission as the slides were displayed. Mr. Strauss responded to a question by the Chair regarding recreation facilities stating that the existing entertainment area and the weight room at Daniells Hall would be available to the students residing in the new building.

Chair Christianson asked why the architect had disregarded the Historical Commission's request for a pitched roof. Mr. Carpenter replied that he had explained to the Historical Commission that a pitched roof would have made the building taller impeding the view of the historical site and that they concurred.

Commissioner Rosenbaum thanked Mr. Carpenter for his presentation and for providing the booklet with the renderings because the 3-D view of the project was easier to visualize and understand.

Chair Christianson reiterated his wish for the palm trees to be re-used.

Commissioner Povero had a question regarding the number of parking spaces. Mr. Peñaflorida explained that the project met the requirements of one parking space for every two students. Mr. Strauss added that it had been his experience that some parking spaces were never used because they had an international population of students and some of them did not own a car.

Mr. Ramos, 25447 First Street, Bryn Mawr commented that, in his opinion pepper, trees were ugly.

Chair Christianson closed the public comment period at 8:07 p.m.

The following motion was presented to the Chair:

**Motion by Varnam, seconded by Rosenbaum, and carried by a vote of 4-0, Werner recused, to recommend to the City Council to Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Approve Precise Plan of Design No. 06-02 and Variance No. 06-04 based on the Findings, and subject to the Conditions of Approval.**

Chair Christianson called for a recess at 8:07 p.m. and the meeting resumed at 8:15 p.m.

**PC-06-34 - TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 17650 & PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN NO. 06-08**

Planning Technician Allan Peñaflorida provided the staff report. He stated that the project was a request to subdivide four existing lots into eight single-family residential lots, demolish two residential structures, and remodel two existing single-family residences. He went on to say that the lots ranged in size from 7,423 square feet to 11,059 square feet and that the proposed residential units ranged in size from 2,000 square feet to 2,300 square feet; with three to four bedrooms and two and one half to three bathrooms each. Mr. Peñaflorida added that the project site was located on the northwest corner of Park Avenue and Curtis Street.

Mr. Peñaflorida explained that on March 27, 2006, the applicants submitted a Precise Plan of Design application for the project to be reviewed concurrently with the Tentative Tract Map application submitted on December 15, 2005. He went on to say that the project was reviewed and deemed complete by the Administrative Review Committee (ARC) on March 28, 2006. He added that, however, additional documents and corrections to the plans were required for analysis, along with a traffic study, and a complete historical resources analysis to evaluate the significance of all resources on the site; the applicant was given until May 10, 2006 to submit the required studies so that the environmental documents could be prepared and project processing could continue. Mr. Peñaflorida stated that the applicant had not submitted any of the technical studies or corrected plans.

Associate Engineer Peterson added that a traffic study had been provided to the Public Works Department. He indicated that the applicant had suggested installing stop signs as a mitigation measure. He added that the City Engineer would not allow this because the line of sight distance issues had not been resolved satisfactorily.

Fire Marshall Rolland Crawford indicated that the applicant had consulted with him and that the space provided for fire apparatus met the Fire Department's standards.

Chair Christianson pointed out that Court Street indicated on the plans was in another part of the City.

Commissioner Varnam asked if the applicants had given any indication that they would be providing the requested information.

Mr. Peñaflorida commented that staff was working against the deadline of the Permit Streamlining Act because the application for the Tentative Tract Map was submitted in December 15, 2005 and the deadline was fast approaching. He added that he had contacted the applicant to request the historical information and that the applicant stated that he had had to change architects, which slowed the project down. However, the May 10, 2006 deadline had passed and the applicant had not provided the necessary information. He continued to say that the applicant was apparently in the process of initiating the request for the historical report. He added that the applicant was aware that the review process for the project would have to begin in order to meet the deadline of the Permit Streamlining Act.

Chair Christianson opened the public comment period at 8:23 p.m.

Richard Wiley, 10878 Pepper Way, Loma Linda commented that the tenants of the residences proposed to be demolished stated that the previous owner had informed them that they would be allowed to stay in the residences; they had not been informed by the new owner that the houses would be demolished. He added they found out about the project when they received the notice of public hearing for the project.

City Attorney Holdaway commented that the City could not get involved in a tenant/landlord dispute because of existing State laws. He added that the City's currently practice was to provide copies of all notices of hearing to the occupants as well as to the property owners of all projects.

Chair Christianson thanked Mr. Wiley for the information and closed the public comment period at 8:26 p.m.

Commissioner Rosenbaum commented that she would prefer to see one-story structures in the area of the North Central Neighborhood to make the project more compatible with the area and stated that this project was completely out of character.

City Attorney Holdaway informed the Planning Commission that if the Commission was considering a motion to deny the project, findings would support a denial of the project under Municipal Code Section 17.30.290.

Chair Christianson asked staff if the applicant was in the audience and found he was not present. A discussion ensued regarding the applicant's disregard of staff's request for information and his absence at the meeting to clarify the situation. Chair Christianson reiterated that the street names had not been labeled appropriately.

**Motion by Povero, seconded by Werner, and carried by a vote of 5-0 to deny Tentative Tract Map no. 17650 and Precise Plan of Design No. 06-08 based on the lack of pertinent information about the project site and the potential effects of the project provided in the environmental analysis; in addition to issues stated in ARC committee meeting regarding Public Works issues of sight distance and alignment, the possible adverse effect on the peace, health, safety and general welfare of the area based on the**

**design and the lack of information, the inadequate identification of mitigation measures plus the mislabeling of the street names.**

Director Woldruff informed the Planning Commission that the applicant could obtain the information and resubmit his application but not within one calendar year from the date of the denial. A discussion ensued on whether to amend the motion to add that the action was without prejudice. Director Woldruff pointed out that the Planning Commission could make a second motion stating that the denial was without prejudice and Attorney Holdaway concurred that the Commission could make a second, clarifying motion to state their intent. The result of the discussion was that the motion would stand as formulated.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

There were no minutes to be approved.

**REPORTS BY THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS**

Vice Chair Werner made a brief presentation with photographs that he took while visiting Portland Oregon during the Christmas holidays.

Chair Christianson commented that a customer had come to his shop and offered to sell a framed aerial photograph of the City of Loma Linda, which Mr. Christianson purchased and was donating to the City.

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT**

Director Woldruff thanked him for the gift and stated that she would find an appropriate place for the print.

Director Woldruff reported that the General Plan was on the agenda for the City Council meeting of June 13, 2006 for final action. She stated that the June 2006 version of the draft General Plan Update was available and would be provided to them on a CD, as soon as possible. She added that the General Plan could be adopted at one of three meetings: June 13, 2006, June 27, 2006 or July 18, 2006 as part of Old Business to be finalized before the newly elected councilman was seated and before the reorganization.

Chair Christianson asked if the changes to the Ordinance regarding the number of Planning Commissioners had been tabled or rescinded. Director Woldruff explained that it had been included in the amendment to the Ordinance. She added that it was at the discretion of the City Council whether or not new members were appointed to the Planning Commission.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.



Minutes approved at the meeting of June 28, 2006.

---

Administrative Secretary

*I:\PlanningCom (PC)\PC 2006Minutes\06-07-06M-draft.doc*

DRAFT